

ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>Kimberly Kullmann

<ADDRESS1>205 E James St

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>Chula Vista

<STATE>CA

<ZIP>91910

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>kim.kullmann@sdcounty.ca.gov

<TEXT>ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>Kimberly Kullmann

<ADDRESS1>205 E James St

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>Chula Vista

<STATE>CA

<ZIP>91910

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>kim.kullmann@sdcounty.ca.gov

<TEXT>ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>Kimberly Kullmann

<ADDRESS1>205 E James St

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>Chula Vista

<STATE>CA

<ZIP>91910

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>kim.kullmann@sdcounty.ca.gov

<TEXT>Please! I can not afford to pay more for my telephone service! I beg you to reject a flat fee proposal that would change how contributions are made to the Universal Service Fund. I am concerned that this proposal could make my current service unaffordable like many other services considered basic by most, which I am rapidly being priced out of. I am just a county government clerk whose COLA raises are at a stand still, and have been for years. As a member of the middle class, I find that my basic living expenses are increasing faster than I can earn. I cannot afford to have a monthly wireless service contract, but must pay as I go; and use my wireless telephone for emergencies only. It is much the same for me with my landline service. I have no frills or options like call-waiting, or caller ID, nor do I make long distance phone calls unless I absolutely must. I've even had to drop my cable television service because of the rising cost of living.

Under the flat fee proposal you are considering, people who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. In other words, low-volume and primarily residential customers would bear the same universal service fund burden as a high-volume residential or business customers. This is truly unfair!

I use my wireless phone for safety and security. I don't want to lose these benefits so that big businesses can pay less than their fair share. I beg you to reject the proposal to move the USF collection system to a flat-fee, and to base the collection on rate of usage.

Keep the USF Fair!

It really is unfair to those of us in the middle class to hit us so hard. Why not tax the high volume users more? They obviously have the money to pay for their usage. Don't let high dollar lobbyists blind you. The middle class is slowly being destroyed in this country by rising costs and dropping incomes. At one time, my income would've been considered respectable, but now, it's laughable in light of the cost of living. I make too much money to qualify for any aid, yet I see people on aid who appear to be more prosperous than myself and my family. This country is losing sight of its backbone, and flat rate increases are not the answer. Those entities who are using the services the most should be paying for the increases, since they're the ones driving up the costs; so why shouldn't they pay the most??? Please do not increase my financial burden further, I beg of you.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Kullmann
205 E James St
Chula Vista, California 91910